



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/290,419      04/13/1999      TSUYOSHI KURIBAYASHI      990409      9862

23850      7590      07/22/2002

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP  
1725 K STREET, NW.  
SUITE 1000  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

ALPHONSE, FRITZ

ART UNIT      PAPER NUMBER

2675

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/290,419

Applicant(s)

Kuribayashi

Examiner

Fritz Alphonse

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 29, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17-26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 35-45, 47, 49, 50, 52, and is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 11, 14, 16, 27, 29, 32, 34, 46, 48, 51, and 53 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2675

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 10, 12-13, 17-21, 28, 30-31, 35-40, 47, 49-50, 54, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Pat. No. 6,100,876) in view of Fukuda (U.S. Pat. No. 5,748,926).

As to claim 1, Tanaka discloses an information processing system which provides input by performing a touch motion on an operating surface (see figures 2-5); Tanaka teaches about the step of determining information indicating a touch state (which is provided by the detection of pen-down time,  $\Delta t$ -Down) when a touch motion has occurred (see column 8, lines 55-67).

Tanaka does not explicitly teach a step of detecting the length of time of a non-touch state in which no touch motion is performed on said operating surface.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Fukuda teaches about a data processing method and apparatus which detect the length of time of a non-touch state in which no touch motion is performed on an operating surface (col. 3, lines 8-17).

Art Unit: 2675

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve upon the data processing method and apparatus, as disclosed by Fukuda. Doing so would provide a method and apparatus capable of discriminatively recognizing patterns of gestures and other characters or figures, and defining gestures effective in any input areas.

As to claim 19, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that claim 19 is an apparatus claim whereas claim 1 is a method. Therefore, claim 19 is analyzed as previously discussed in rejected claim 1 above.

As to claim 38, this claim differs from claim 1 in that the limitation "recorded medium" is recited in the preamble. Tanaka teaches that the information is stored in memory (V-RAM). See column 4, lines 7-11.

As to claims 2 and 20, Tanaka does not teach when a touch state occurs, the first step detects the length of time of the non-touch state that follows the touch state. However, this limitation is disclosed by Fukuda (col. 3, lines 8-17).

As to claims 3 and 21 and 40, Tanaka teaches that the state is a touch state whether or not the time is larger than a predetermined length of time (col. 9, lines 21-25).

As to claims 12 and 30, Tanaka (figs. 2-6) shows an input processing method, including the step of performing information processing in response to a touch state indicating information, and wherein said touch motion is performed using a pen (see figure 5) on said operating surface (32), and said non-touch state is a pen up state (42), and/or, said touch state is a pen down state (41).

Art Unit: 2675

As to claims 13 and 31, Tanaka (fig. 5) shows an input processing method, wherein said touch motion is performed using a pen on said operating surface, and said non-touch state is a pen up state, and/or said touch state is a pen down state.

As to claims 17-18, 35, 37 and 54, Tanaka discloses an input processing method, wherein said device comprises a display section (5) and said touch motion operating surface is arranged in said display section (col. 3, lines 12-16), and wherein each of said steps is carried out only when a designated mode is set active (col. 2, lines 11-16).

As to claims 36 and 39, the claims have substantially the limitations of claims 1-2. Therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claims 1-2 above.

As to claim 49-50, the claims have substantially the limitations of claims 12-13. Therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claims 12-13 above.

As to claims 10, 28 and 47, Tanaka (figs. 4-6) shows an input processing method including a function for determining information indicating the termination of the touch state (e.g., pen up, pen down) after the function has determined said touch state indicating information and said touch state has ended (col. 10, lines 58-64).

3. Claims 4-6, 22-24, 41-43, 7-8, 25-26, 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanamaki (JP 08314606A) in view of Fukuda (U.S. Pat. No. 5,748,926).

As to claim 4, Hanamaki teaches about a device for inputting information by performing a touch motion on an operating surface. That device detects the number of successive occurrences of a touch motion (see abstract; page 2, lines 19-38);

Art Unit: 2675

Hanamaki does not explicitly teach about a step of determining information indicating a touch state in accordance with the detected number of occurrences. However, this limitation is disclosed by Fukuda (col. 3, lines 8-17):

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve upon the data processing system, as disclosed by Fukuda. Doing so would provide a method and apparatus capable of discriminatively recognizing patterns of gestures and other characters or figures, and defining gestures effective in any input areas.

As to claim 5, Hanamaki discloses an input processing method that detects the number of occurrences of a touch motion over a predetermined length of time (col. 3, lines 43-65).

As to claim 6, the claim has substantially the limitations of claims 4-5. Therefore, it is analyzed as previously discussed in claims 4-5 above.

As to claims 22-24 and 41-43, the claims have substantially the limitations of claims 4-5. Therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claims 4-5 above.

As to claims 7-8, 25-26, 44-45, Hanamaki does not teach a method, wherein when the number of occurrences is 1, the second step determines that the state is not the touch state, and when the detected number of occurrences is 2 or more, the state is the touch state and a single click has occurred, and/or when the detected number of occurrences is 3 a double click has occurred.

This is very obvious. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate the number of occurrences with numerical 1-3. This would have been obvious to provide a data processing method capable of discriminatively recognizing

Art Unit: 2675

patterns of gestures and other characters or figures and defining gestures effective in any input areas as is known by those skilled in the art.

4. Claims, 15, 33, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanamaki (JP 08314606A) in view of Weber (U.S. Pat. No. 5,572,651).

As to claims 15, 33, 52, Hanamaki discloses an input processing device which provides input by performing a touch motion on an operating surface. That device detects the number of successive occurrences of a touch motion (see abstract; page 2, lines 19-38)

Hanamaki does not teach the step of determining a corresponding mouse operation in accordance with the detected number of occurrences. However, this limitation is disclosed by Weber (col. 19, lines 9-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hanamaki by specifically providing a table-based interface, as disclosed by Weber. Doing so would provide a flexible and powerful retrieval tool into graphical information, without requiring the use of expensive recognition algorithms.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 9, 11, 14, 16, 27, 29, 32, 34, 46, 48, 51, 53 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2675

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Crane et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,040,010) discloses an identification by handwriting verification.

Nakamura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,866,646) discloses a handheld data input apparatus.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fritz Alphonse whose telephone number is (703) 308-8534.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras, can be reached at (703) 305-9720.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 ( for Technology Center 2600 only )**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).




Art Unit: 2675

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

  
F. Alphonse

Art Unit: 2675

July 19, 2002

  
STEVEN SARAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600